

July 13, 2023

PRESENT: David Reilly, Chairman
Ralph Neubauer
Rocco Logozzo
Larry Jones

Britton Bistran, Village Planner

Stephen Angel, Village Attorney

Maeghan Mackie, Board Secretary

Brad Hammond, Building & Zoning Administrator

ABSENT: Michael Schermeyer
Ron Hill, Village Engineer

WESTHAMPTON BEACH PLANNING BOARD
Meeting held on THURSDAY JULY 13, 2023, 5:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. by David Reilly; and he asked for the audience to stand and salute the flag.

Mr. Reilly stated there were two decisions to start the agenda.

DECISIONS:

OZMAR PROPERTIES- 103 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-11-2-20.1

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **OZMAR PROPERTIES- 103 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-11-2-20.1** as written; seconded by Mr. Jones and carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

NEW YORK CANCER & BLOOD SPECIALISTS- 40 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-12-3-15

James N. Hulme, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Reilly stated that there was a determination, and the reading was waived. Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **NEW YORK CANCER & BLOOD SPECIALISTS- 40 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-12-3-15** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA:

SITE PLAN REVIEW:

WH EQUITY GROUP, LLC 12,22,80 MONTAUK HWY & OLD RIVERHEAD ROAD

-Continued work session on Park Fee, appraisal & affordable housing

James N. Hulme, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application. He provided the Board with a copy of their deed when they purchased the property and said they are having difficulty finding an appraiser.

Mr. Angel said they need an appraisal, they can't decide whether its arm's length or market value, and he suggested that they contact him regarding finding appraisers.

Mr. Hulme said if they could convince the appraiser that did Rogers Avenue to do the same for them, would that be acceptable?

Mr. Angel said he could reach out to her.

Mr. Hulme said she took the transaction and looked at market trends since then, but the starting point was the purchase price.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Angel said he or Mr. Pasca can reach out to Ms. Parsons, and he will give them two or three names and see if they can find one. I don't think there's a form of an appraisal, I think this Board would feel better about a professional appraisal.

Mr. Reilly said he'd like to see some methodology for it.

Mr. Hulme said regarding the park fee, the affordable units are not included in the parking calculation, is that true? 197-80.S.3 is the paragraph that gives the 50% credit, but it indicates that the park fee does not include the park fee calculation so they are looking at a park fee for 38 units, and not 45. If there could be conformation on that, and lastly, the Code also provides for an opportunity to pay the park fee over time and in a particular pace, I suspect this project will be phased and it will be reviewed and permits issued as it commences we are thinking maybe marrying the permits to payments for the park fees. We don't need an answer for that now, but we're hoping to open the concept.

Mr. Neubauer asked if it's been done before?

Mr. Hammond said Timber Ridge there was discussion about the park fee; we did do installments for it and I would have to research how it was done.

Mr. Reilly asked if they were phased? I know there was a construction plan but I don't know if it was phased.

Mr. Hulme said I think there was.

Mr. Reilly said we knew it was going to be built in phases, so we were able to.

Mr. Hulme said that's likely what will happen here. He will consult with the Building Inspector and return with their proposal. They also want to calculate the purchase price for the affordable units, and the Village Code is not complete to calculate the number and we'll have to do an offering plan and include the values for the affordable units and its my understanding the Village and the Town are discussing it, but we're looking for more detail to do the math ourselves to see how it'll work.

Mr. Angel said there was discussion with the Town on the Code and how it would be administered and who would, but Mr. Pasca was involved in them and will have information. That has to be set soon, that's correct.

WESTHAMPTON PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LLC-141 MONTAUK HWY SCTM#905-5-2-6.1

-Continued work session on Site Plan

John J. Bennett, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application together with Vince Gaudeilleo, The Raynor Group and Joseph Guerra Citarella. Mr. Benntt said the lats time they appeared they discussed the coordination issues and I think we are in a position to coordinate the lot to the East and I believe its on to discuss tonight. We submitted a new plan on June 30, 2023. I want to make sure that we are anxious to get up and running and I want to make sure the coordination issues are cleared up. We think we have a good solution that makes the most sense in terms of being consistent with the manner of operation but also meeting the concerns of the Village of access coordination.

Mr. Reilly said the main discussion was the plan early on to have cross access from Sunset Avenue to Oak Street; and to be fair after your last presentation I went to the site and I did not realize how much deeper the Western property's go as compared to the others so you would be making a wild "S" turn and for those practical reasons we came to the conclusion that the full cut through is not appropriate for this lot and I do see you indicate some cross access to the East allowing it to feed out on to Sunset Avenue.

Mr. Bennett said from the site point of view, it was impractical and I appreciate the comments.

Vince Gaudiello, Raynor Group said he has been retained by the applicant to assist with the Engineering. He looked at both applications and we sat down and took the comments and we broke them down with respect to the recommendations of the staff, and in essence we provided the Village with an alignment plan and we're showing the improvements we're proposing. They are not fully engineered plans, they are 2 Dimensional and we're proposing to modify the site entrance to align with Hazelwood Avenue and that intersection will have an entrance in and space for 2 Exit Lanes to make a right and go East or go West on to Montauk Highway or go straight down Hazelwood Avenue; it provides an Easterly connection and the site plan previously submitted that curb alignment is exact. It's a true transition from one site to the other and I intend to sit and hear what that applicant is proposing

July 13, 2023

and we will sit with them and work through the details of this. My client is the applicant not the owner, but they will sign the cross access. We're providing 37 parking spaces, and the aisle widths are 24' wide and we're proposing 26' wide aisles and that gives more maneuverability in the parking lot.

Mr. Reilly asked where and how the deliveries happen.

Mr. Gaudiello said they come in off Montauk Highway and circle in front of the building, they go to the East and back into the back of the site and I will provide a truck turning radius on the next submission.

Mr. Bennett said the Citarella trucks go back and forth and they are box trucks, they are not tractor trailers.

Mr. Gaudiello said we don't use tractor trailers, but we will give a radius for the Village Engineer. In addition to the access we're proposing sidewalks and curbs along Montauk Highway and we'll apply to Suffolk County DPW and we've had preliminary conversations with them. With respect to the sanitary, were going to apply to WWM and we've had discussions and they have no record of the system that exists on the property. I think our discussion today is to resolve the alignment issues and where you expect cross access, how many parking spaces, the improvements in the right of way and the sanitary system improvements.

Mr. Logozzo asked if they've contacted the Easterly property?

Mr. Gaudiello said the owner of our property has been.

Mr. Logozzo said that owner said he has not heard from him.

Mr. Reilly said you indicated you would have coordination with them?

Mr. Gaudiello said I don't see any avenue this Board can take without us working together. I took the comments issued by this Board and discussed them with Mr. Hammond and our next step is to sit down with the neighbor.

Mr. Reilly said you need a conceptual site plan side by side. The only concern, and I want to hear Mr. Hill's comments is the access out on to Montauk Highway, left turns going across traffic and then straight into Hazelwood Avenue that's a residential street, I want to see a right turn only out and if you want to go Left you can go to Sunset and make the left from the stop sign. It's a conflict point of traffic.

Mr. Gaudiello said that's an objective in aligning with Hazelwood Avenue, I can talk to Mr. Hill. My only concern is that you're taking the burden of people going West and bringing through two other parcels and forcing them to Sunset Avenue.

Mr. Reilly said that's the only thing that's jumped out but it's a vast improvement.

Mr. Gaudiello said we have to see what the DPW says too.

Mr. Neubauer said the residents of Hazelwood Avenue may not want that traffic on their road.

Mr. Gaudiello said going out on to Sunset Avenue is a homerun. But if you're coming to the beach and stopping here you aren't familiar with Sunset Avenue and keeping the circulation is not having people trying to figure out how to get off the property. The GPS will tell them to make a left and go down Oak Street and we'll talk to Ron Hill and talk to the County DPW too.

Mr. Neubauer said they did a great job with the revision.

Mr. Reilly said he agrees. He asked if there's any comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

Ms. Bistran said they need to work with Ron Hill and give us some lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Hammond said they have to apply to the ZBA. If we're conceptually okay with this, there are no variances that are needed from this revision and they should go to the ZBA. We do need to talk about SEQRA. The building is over 5,000 and the addition is not over.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Bennett said I don't see how you escape Type II and it's an addition less than 4,000 square feet to a commercial building.

Mr. Guerra said the building is less than 5,000.

Mr. Bennett said SEQRA is calling it Type II.

Mr. Hammond said you can start with Department of Health with Type II.

Mr. Reilly said do you want to wait for ZBA to return?

Mr. Bennett said no, we want to move parallel.

Mr. Gaudiello said this requires Board of Health before you get an approval.

Mr. Reilly said we are okay with the layout you can go to the ZBA and work on that. Coordinate the accesses with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Neubauer thanked him for the revisions.

161 MONTAUK HWY LLC-161 MONTAUK HWY SCTM#905-5-2-12.1

-Continued work session on Site Plan

Marcus Stinchi appeared on behalf of the application, together with Marcus Stinchi. Mr. Stinchi said he owns both 161 Montauk Highway and 171 Montauk Highway. He submitted a plan waiting on this plan and I think the two parcels have to look at individually and my neighbor to the West has a proposal and it has nothing to do with me except for cross access.

Mr. Logozzo said we're assuming that you guys talked.

Mr. Stinchi said we have not. We have been held up for theirs and that's not fair, does he think they are independent. I submitted a complete plan and there were no comments, there was none on the neighbors property.

Mr. Reilly said I think now, I appreciate there was some lack of communication between the two property owners initially, plus once we thought this full cross access was going to happen we see it won't work.

Mr. Stinchi said I can argue it wasn't practical for me. But I was asked to do it so I did, I thought it was part of the master plan and if we're not doing it then we can close the two; either we're working together or we're not. This has nothing to do with their application and what I've been asked to do.

Mr. Reilly said it isn't practical on this property.

Mr. Stinchi said it was required of me at a great expense. So again, are we going to work the same or looking at them individually.

Mr. Reilly said in this case, specifically because you're both looking to develop adjacent properties simultaneously its good to review it parallel.

Mr. Stinchi said I submitted, and I'm not sure what besides cross access has to be reviewed together.

Mr. Hammond asked what Marcus question is. You did receive their submission, so it's not going to work with your plan as you proposed?

Mr. Stinchi said it works with my plan ,it's just independent. Why are we here and the Engineer isn't here with no comments. Why isn't he saying whether it works or not. It's costing them

Mr. Hammond said at the last meeting there was no cross access and now there is.

Mr. Stinchi said you are good with his proposal, what's my solution.

Mr. Hammond said I communicated it with you' you can do the joint ingress and egress on the West and do the same on the East.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Stinchi said I don't want a commercial entrance between the two.

Mr. Hammond said you're giving yourself the same cross access and you can get in and out of the wine store easier.

Mr. Stinchi said if those are comments from the Engineer we could have had the plans tonight.

Mr. Hammond said these two lots are much wider and have the ability to have ingress and egress and Mr. Hill will have comments; we've moved forward and they sound like they want to work with you we do have to do SEQRA too.

Mr. Vero said he thinks now the onus is on us to redesign our project to accommodate their project. We listened to Mr. Hill's comments and he made them without their application, and now there is no coordination and that's Mr. Stinchi's frustration.

Mr. Reilly said you know how to reach Mr. Hill. If you want to move forward you can reach out to Mr. Hill to discuss them and I appreciate the comments.

Mr. Vero said that's Mr. Stinchi's frustration, there are no comments.

Mr. Stinchi said we have to redesign our entire site plan now.

Mr. Vero said I can redesign it but my clients frustrated.

Mr. Bennett said this is a bit of a chicken and the egg; we thought coordination made the most sense but we wanted to make sure this Board was happy with it. We didn't want to be presumptuous, and we know and we can engage in conversation and we want to make sure the Board is happy with this plan before we engaged with you.

Jefferson Murphree represents the property to the West and they had a long discussion with site plan approval and he presented a cross access plan and we gave up parking spaces and we have an easement filed on our property.

Mr. Reilly said it was not ever brought to our attention that to accomplish the full cross access required an unsafe turn, but the idea itself has merit, we can funnel traffic out to Oak Street and Sunset Avenue and relieve the burden to Montauk Highway there is still a practical result to ease the traffic.

Mr. Murphree asked if his clients cross access still exists?

Mr. Reilly said it will funnel to Oak Street there won't be a connection in the middle.

Mr. Murphree said they will look at it.

Mr. Stinchi said an overlay from Sunset to Oak so you can see where they are now and where they are being proposed.

Mr. Reilly said that's what I realized we needed and I saw the site physically and it would have been helpful to see months ago.

Mr. Stinchi said an overlay would have been helpful. So the neighbor of 171 Montauk Highway to the East is a complete zig zag from Sunset Avenue to 171 Montauk Highway and then from 171 Montauk Highway we tried to straighten it out and 24' to 161 Montauk Highway and it's 20' and for some reason they reduced the aisle to 20' from 24'.

Mr. Neubauer said ultimately that will be developed one day.

Mr. Stinchi said the other issue is fire access and getting their trucks in and out. It all ends up to be about cross access if you're going to do it for one you have to do it for all and you can do it on the Citarella lot and its been consistent with what has been done all over the Village.

Mr. Reilly said we appreciate it.

Mr. Stinchi said take it into consideration.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Reilly said even Mr. Hill thought it would not work and I'm assuming between Mr. Hill and Mr. Collins they thought it would work.

Mr. Stinchi said to turn the walk in and create the cross access. He said it's possible, I'm telling you it is possible and I'm not happy about it. I don't care if they have cross access or not and I was required to do it at great expense.

Mr. Bennett said do you care about it or not?

Mr. Stinchi said I don't care about it, but I was told I had to do it so why do I have to but someone else doesn't?

Mr. Bennett said you don't take a concept and jam it into everyone's property. Just because it works on one doesn't mean it works on all, sometimes it doesn't work. Maybe the information and what was presented and looked at wasn't as thorough; they didn't say don't worry about it and we've had meetings and it doesn't make sense. And you had to do it doesn't mean that we do.

32 MILL LLC-32 MILL ROAD SCTM#905-12-4-50

-Continued work session on Modification of Site Plan approval to convert a second floor office to a dining room and associated improvements.

Erin Finley appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Reilly said before we get started, there was a lot of conversation and things said at the last meeting because there is a lot going on with this property, but tonight we are not discussing enforcement issues and only what is being proposed. Ms. Finley has given a lot of material and he wants her to explain what is going on.

Ms. Finley said she appreciates the feedback she received, and she believes that this Board has everything and has complied with this Board's requests and she's happy to go through the letters from the Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Reilly said let's get back to the scope; as I understand this you have 15 seats now and you want to take 8 and move them upstairs and have 7 seats on the first floor and 8 on the second floor and that's all that there will ever be? You're proposing the existing use downstairs and this other use, it's not another use and adjunct. Will the operations be ceased and done and will there be an overlap?

Ms. Finley said there is an overlap two nights a week.

Mr. Reilly said that will affect parking if they are both open?

Ms. Finley said closing the dining room but the market is open until 6:00 p.m. and the upstairs is open at 5:30.

Mr. Reilly said we are looking at and not having both operating at the same time and in terms of employees how will that work?

Ms. Finley said I submitted a narrative; a couple of people open we have our primary employees in the middle of the day up to 7 from 12pm – 3pm and the morning shift is leaving and most are kids and they leave and the night staff comes in and at 6:30 the remaining day staff leaves so you're down to 4. There are 7 in the mid day and 7 in the cross over; and I know 7 is a lot and I did not reduce it and it was done in 2014 and it was not reduced, and I know Mr. Hill pointed out a mistake with the retail and we're within the parking calculations still and I don't know how it's calculated with the full square footage we're still within the 18 spots.

Mr. Reilly asked will you anticipate more than 7?

Ms. Finley said most help are high school students who can't drive, and you can't do a parking calculation based on that but right now, 5 don't drive. They don't have licenses there are managers who do drive but counter help are the 14 to 17 year olds.

Mr. Reilly said I want to avoid problems going forward, your application to Department of Health indicates 16 seats.

Ms. Finley said that's correct; they don't have an application for what we're doing and on page 1 it asks for what I want to do and that's put 8 seats upstairs and it says current is 16 and proposed is 16 but I'm not adding 8 seats.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Reilly said right now you have 15.

Ms. Finley said BOH has 15, we proposed 8 and 7 and the BOH has the same plan and it's a 16 seat luncheonette and we didn't look and see and say 15 or 16. My Department of Health approval says 16. She said that A3 and A5 show the 8 seats and the 7 seats.

Mr. Neubauer said we're in limbo until we receive Board of Health.

Ms. Finley said I received a letter from WWM and the first thing is on their list says she has to submit a copy of the planning board approval. And you don't give one without their approval. I know different municipalities have different rules, and I told them that but that's what I'm down to and everything else, including SLA has gone through. We received our approval today and WWM sent us to pollution control and they do not need to review it. They wanted to see the site plan and showing the 8 seats and 7 seats in total and I supplied that letter to you as well. Mr. Hill is requesting WWM and they are requesting an approval from this Board. When we do events we have grills outside and the fire marshal says you can't cover the grill, and the BOH says you can't cover the grill and when there are two conflicting agencies.

Mr. Hammond asked her to send what she got from WWM and he will try to get in touch with them.

Ms. Bistran said you have to submit the food permit, and WWM will issue notices, they are called NOI and they say on their list what's needed. When you get the notice we can write a letter in that case, but we have to see the notices with nothing but the Village approval. You submitted one May 20, 2023 from food control we need the NOI to have nothing on it but the fact that they need approvals. She said we had comments regarding the deck when it was converted from an office to the new use the second floor was tenants and private use and there was deck correspondence from 2014 and the use was semi private and limited and now that this is a public use we feel that the deck is incongruous with that and hard to monitor it and that's an issue for the Board of Health and we felt comfortable suggesting, if it's a publicly used area the deck use the existing door should be converted to a window.

Ms. Finley said we have locked it, and I did put in a FOIL request to show it was locked. There was a noise complaint, there was no noise again and he came to see no one was on the deck; he was informed it was locked and it's not something we're offering and I sit out there and whisper and it's not worth it. It doesn't need to be used and taken out of the advertising it will go back to my private use and my employees take lunch on the deck and that's it.

Mr. Reilly said we will put that in the determination.

Ms. Bistran said if the public use is going to take place, we would like to see it prevented from being used. It has to be a physical deterrent. It can't be a key or a lock, if you want a public use of the second floor.

Mr. Reilly said it has to be in accessible.

Ms. Finley said a deadbolt?

Mr. Jones asked if it's an egress issue?

Ms. Finley said no.

Mr. Reilly said if that's okay we can try it. You may not own it forever and someone else may, we need a mechanism to monitor.

Ms. Finley said for the general public it hasn't been used.

Mr. Neubauer said it hasn't been a restaurant either.

Ms. Finley said she's not certain this can be held over, can you move ahead contingent on WWM I know the forms are wanted.

Mr. Reilly said we can not give a conditional or temporary approval from the agencies.

Mr. Neubauer said this was what we discussed last time.

July 13, 2023

Ms. Finley said she's not clear about how to get an approval from them.

Mr. Reilly said if you get the other items taken care of, the Village can talk to WWM.

Ms. Bistran said if you get a notice from Food Control and WWM and we have a confident level you're going to get an approval, and we can write that into a resolution. But we can't move forward until we get those with nothing else on them.

Mr. Angel said you need the redesign of the deck?

Ms. Bistran said we need the resolution on the deck.

Mr. Hammond said there are two doors to the deck? There's a door from your office to the deck and a door at the top of the stair to the deck, the one at the top of the stair needs to be removed.

Ms. Finley said okay.

Mr. Neubauer said eliminating that door will go miles.

Mr. Reilly asked if there any other questions or comments. He opened this up to the public hearing.

Ms. Wolfersdorf said that only 4 out of 17 calls were not corroborated and when they were brought up to Trustee Tymann he said you could not operate until its approved and you could cease until the Code is complied with. In that invitation this is referred to the Business District but it is the HC and the yellow is the only HC and the red ring is the business district and its intended to be a transition zone so it's supposed to be a lighter use and more restrictive and within this the yellow area there are two food services and one is on Montauk Highway they have 160' to 170' to the neighbors with no outdoor dining. From my home to this business there is 60' and 90' so we're much closer so comparing the only two food services in the HC is very different than Main Street. It's a 15 seat luncheonette and today in reality there are 23 seats in the sun room and this from 2019 Zillow listing and you are questioning these chairs there's another angle. So the current submission shows it dropping to 7 seats, so I don't know how its permanently restricted and there's been 8 weeks of a keep out at this location, and I don't know how this will be accomplished, how do you segregate them and it will migrate back.

Mr. Reilly said the Planning Board cannot plan based on fears of violation, we can plan for what it is and proposed and if its violated there's trouble.

Ms. Wolfersdorf said right, as discussed there could be future owners. And Mr. Hill suggested that its segregating to remove the ability to bring seating back.

Mr. Reilly said I want it to be very clear that there are 7 down and 8 up and they won't migrate. And that's what would be this Board considers and I appreciate what you are saying. In terms of intensity it's the same problem.

Ms. Wolfersdorf said in practice, the space is used more than 16 seats, and not limited to 21 seats outside. This is a large party held the night after the last meeting on the front lawn. Theres no swapping, trading its all uses at once which is our contention. This is the same party that carried on until 11:00 p.m. and the crowd was sizable. It wasn't too noisy, but it's large for a 15 seat luncheonette. Back to the space in question, this is the office in 2019 which was discussed as a tasting room and these are the renovations and the changes are drastic and it was an office and now a restaurant open to the public. It was advertised as a private dining room and there was never a rule about having 6 clients up there why would it be different now. It's a lot more than 6 people, it's three seatings of 8-10 plus 4 employees and its significant. There's a Newsday article of July 12 and the reporter said there is three seatings, and they came with a group of 10 which is more than 8, just like downstairs is 15 but its 23 and there are 4 employees shown in the photos. The application to WWM is inaccurate, it states there is no food preparation taking place and this is a rice cooker and a torch and it says everything is disposable and there is glassware, bowls, and ceramic serving platters. The existing deck doesn't show any seating and the deck in 2019 shows couches and a table, if I can hear their conversations they can hear mine from that deck. The public being up there is robbing us of our privacy because we don't know who is up there. I would like to see it permanently deleted for the future owners. I have no issues with the parking calculations, but I propose that the sushi is in addition, not a swap or curtailing and both uses will operate at once and its in addition, the math is 10 seats and there are 4 employees as we saw and discussed so that requires 8 spaces and the original 16 fro downstairs is 24 so they need an additional 6 spaces. There are five other seats for congregation and the roof deck as well. I don't know if parking needed for them, but they need more than what is there.

July 13, 2023

Mr. Reilly asked if the couches have to be shown on the floor plan?

Ms. Bistran asked about the deck?

Mr. Reilly said the ones in the dining area.

Ms. Bistran said that was in Mr. Hill's memo, they need to be calculated.

Ms. Wolfersdorf said behind the sushi suite is Michael Sinesky and he says that Simple Venue operates as a partner and consultant and to quote the WWM application, she is asking them to consider the arrangement as a strip mall and its no different it encompasses two floor. Whatever this space is not Sydney's Cuisine or Sydney's Inc and it's a separate use not the same. Its three commercial uses on a lot of 21,000 square feet and the swapping or elimination is impossible to enforce.

Ms. Finley said she will address the key points, she has a marketing and management contract and its my restaurant and use and in my kitchen and they are aware we bring them upstairs in a Bento box; plating is not consideration a preparation and the glasses are plastic and disposable and yes they look like glass and they are disposable. Platters are permitted to be washed in a downstairs kitchen you can't plate on real and you can put disposable on the platters. The strip mall was taken out of context the WWM was not sure how to look at it and you now have this, usually the only time we designate separate uses in the building and its only done in a strip mall so I don't know how to approach this. He was not sure how to treat it and it was resolved.

Ms. Bistran said these are not Planning Board issues.

Mr. Reilly asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Benay Dijia, 858 Dune Road Westhampton Beach offered public comment in support of the applicant.

Mr. Reilly asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Lara Ross, 32 Jessup Avenue Quogue offered public comment in support of the applicant.

Mr. Reilly asked if anyone had questions or comments.

Deirdre DaVita, Remsenburg offered public comment in support of the applicant.

Mr. Reilly asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were no other questions or comments and he told Ms. Finley to return everything to the Board.

SEAFIELD CENTER, INC, 7 SEAFIELD LANE SCTM#905-14-1-8.2

- Initial work session on Waiver of Site Plan to use existing parking lot in the evenings for valet car service during the hours of 4:30pm to 1:00am

John Gonzalez, Check Valet appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Hammond said so parking is a big issue the Trustees are redoing a parking study, we are trying to make it work on the weekends and the Village trustees talked to this group, Check Valet and they are in Patchogue and want to see if they can help and run the operation out here. There are a lot of good reasons, the concept is great, and where to take the car they need one site for insurance purposes and looking around the Village didn't want to corner off a municipal lot so the principals of the company reached out to large parking lot holders and talked to the Epley's and when they purchased the South East lot there was a parking expansion and they are agreeable to them using this site; they don't need it on the weekends and talking to Mr. Pasca, to make it official it's a private parking lot and there's potential if you see to a waiver to allow them to use the unused parking at times when its closed its okay.

Mr. Reilly said my concern is are we opening a door to multiple uses.

Mr. Neubauer asked about liability for the Village being the agency that precipitates it.

Mr. Hammond said that's why its on a private parking lot and insurance; the Village is supportive of it.

Mr. Neubauer said we aren't objecting to it?

July 13, 2023

Mr. Hammond said yes, we aren't sponsoring it or benefiting from it. We can talk about it temporarily or seasonal.

Mr. Gonzalez said Friday and Saturday from 4:00 p.m on.

Mr. Neubauer asked where the valets are?

Mr. Gonzalez said we come to your location, and we take your car to the parking lot and once you're done you reach out to us and we bring the car back.

Mr. Logozzo said you don't interact with the restaurant owners, how do you coordinate with the drivers.

Mr. Gonzalez said they can do a reservation through the business or we have a way on our website you request a time

Mr. Hammond said we can do it as a one year that mirrors the outdoor tables.

FILL APPLICATION REVIEW: NONE

WORK SESSION AGENDA:

TRUSTEE REFERRAL:

WHB 149 Main, LLC., 149 Main Street (905-11-3-1) Flora

– Continued work session for Applicants request of 28 seats and 8 tables in the front of their building; with no seating on the Easterly side; No Music

No one appeared on behalf of the application. The Board did not have any objection to the placement of 28 seats in total, and 8 tables in front of the building.

Haskell's Seafood, 77A Main Street (905-11-2-9)

-Continued work session for Applicants request of 3 café tables with a privacy barrier; five (2) seat café tables in the back with three (4) seat tables; No Music

Peter Haskell he submitted follow up photographs and surveys.

Mr. Reilly said you're proposing 28 or 26 seats?

Mr. Haskell said 3 café tables in the front; 5 two seats in the back; and 12

Mr. Logozzo asked if its acceptable?

Mr. Hammond said yes, it's annual

Remigio Rivera, Mi Pueblito Restaurant 136 Old Riverhead Road (905-1-1-4)

-Applicant requests four tables, and sixteen (16) chairs.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. The Board did not have any objection to the application, but the applicant is only allowed (12) chairs in total in his zoning district and Mr. Reilly requested that be stated in the referral back to the Board of Trustees.

Pawcasso Art Studio, 3 Sunset Avenue (905-12.1-1-9)

-Applicant requests five (5) tables and sixteen (16) chairs.

Barbara Martorelli appeared on behalf of the application. The Board had no objection to the application however they wanted to see better pictures of the set up and would refer it back to the Trustees upon receipt of pictures with the width of the alley way laid out and the size of the tables.

SUBDIVISION REVIEW: NONE

SITE PLAN REVIEW: NONE

July 13, 2023

FILL APPLICATION REVIEW: NONE

MINUTES:

JUNE 22, 2023 (Full Board)

EXTENSION REQUEST

Avidor Group, LLC., 133 Montauk Highway (905-5-2-4-5 and 38) Applicant requests one year extension of their planning board approval.

Jefferson Murphree appeared on behalf of the application.

The Board said they would issue a one year extension and would like to see the site cleaned up.

The applicants agent Jefferson Murphree agreed to cleaning the site up and thanked the Board.

HOLDOVERS:

1. 85 & 105 MONTAUK LLC- 85 &105 MONTAUK HWY SCTM#905-5-1-12, 53.1 &52.2
2. ROGER'S AVENUE ASSOCIATES- ROGER'S AVENUE SCTM#905-3-1-7.1-7.7)
3. PRIME STORAGE- 98 DEPOT ROAD SCTM#905-2-1-19.1
4. 55 OLD RIVERHEAD ROAD LLC- 55 &59 OLD RIVERHEAD ROAD SCTM#905-4-1-7, 9.2, 9.3
5. FIRST DUNES DEVELOPMENT 496 LLC- 496 DUNE ROAD SCTM#905-16-1-19
6. 10 MITCHELL OWNER LLC- 10 MITCHELL ROAD SCTM#905-11-2-3
7. DRL IRREVOCABLE TRUST & CAROL SCHECTER- 12 PONTUNK LANE & 42 STEVEN'S LANE SCTM#905-11-1-3.2 & 7
8. BMB ENTERPRISES INC.- 145 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-11-2-29 (8/10/2023)
9. ROBERT SCHOENTHAL- 22 BAYFIELD LANE SCTM#905-10-6-2 (8/24/2023)
10. WESTHAMPTON COUNTRY CLUB- 35 POTUNK LANE SCTM#905-9-3-23.1
11. WESTHAMPTON INN, LLC, 43 MAIN STREET SCTM#905-11-1-15
12. RICHARD OLIVO-72 SOUTH ROAD SCTM#905-8-1-27
13. SUNSET WEST LLC, 87 SUNSET AVENUE SCTM#905-12-1-49.1

FUTURE MEETINGS:

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2023

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 2023